

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

DOMINICK D. MITCHEM,

Petitioner

v.

C-1-03-580

MARC HOUK,

Respondent

ORDER

This matter was referred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 to the United States Magistrate Judge for consideration and report on the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed by the petitioner pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (doc. no. 13) recommending that the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus be dismissed to which neither party has objected.

Upon a *de novo* review of the record, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge has accurately set forth the applicable law and has properly applied it to the particular facts of this case. Accordingly, in the absence of any objection by petitioner, this Court accepts the Report as uncontroverted.

Accordingly, the Court accepts the factual findings and legal reasoning of the Magistrate Judge and hereby **ADOPTS AND INCORPORATES BY REFERENCE** into this Order his Report and Recommendation dated September 13, 2005. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is, therefore, **DENIED WITH PREJUDICE**.

A certificate of appealability will not be issued with respect to petitioner's grounds for relief because petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right remediable in this federal habeas corpus proceeding. *See* 28 U.S.C. 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). Petitioner has not shown that reasonable jurists could debate whether these claims should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were "adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further." *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 323–24 (2003) (quoting *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484–84 (2000)) (in turn quoting *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 n.4 (1983)).

With respect to an application by petitioner to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis*, this Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith for purposes of granting petitioner leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*. *See Fed. R. App. 24(a); Kincade v. Sparkman*, 117 F.3d 949, 952 (1997).

This case is **DISMISSED AND TERMINATED** on the docket of this Court.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Herman J. Weber  
Herman J. Weber, Senior Judge  
United States District Court